DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 225 FL 018 270

TITLE	Educating for Diversity: Teaching Values, Cultures & Languages.
INSTITUTION	American Jewish Committee, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Feb 89
NOTE	23p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 Street, New York, NY 10022-2746 ($2.00; quantity discount).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; Citizenship Education; Community Involvement; Cultural Pluralism; *Democratic Values; *Educational Change; Educational Needs; *Intergroup Relations; *Multicultural Education; *Second Language Programs; Teacher Education; Teacher Role; Values Education
IDENTIFIERS	American Jewish Committee; *Diversity (Groups)

ABSTRACT

The report of the American Jewish Committee's Task Force on Education Policy focuses on the changes that are necessary to improve the American education system, and that go beyond the reforms suggested in the early 1980s. Based on the idea that educating the entire school population is the goal of the "second stage" of the reform movement, the report identifies four areas of educational change and improvement and proposes general and specific strategies for addressing these changes. The four areas include: (1) teaching young people about common core democratic values and encouraging their active participation in the democratic process; (2) strengthening pluralism and intergroup understanding in the classroom through multicultural education; (3) developing and implementing language programs in the classroom based on knowledge of how children of different linguistic backgrounds learn language and communication skills; and (4) using intergroup and community leadership skills to mobilize community support to help the schools adapt to these new educational changes. Programs currently addressing these four areas are described briefly, and guidelines for developing similar initiatives in other settings are suggested. Implications for teacher preparation are also discussed. Resource organizations, programs, and publications in all four areas are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318225

EDUCATING FOR DIVERSITY

Teaching Values, Cultures & Languages

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Grossman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 Street, New York, NY 10022-2746

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL018270

EDUCATING FOR DIVERSITY

Teaching Values, Cultures & Languages

This report of the American Jewish Committee's Task Force on Education Policy was prepared under the direction of Arnold B. Gardner, task force chair, and Marilyn Braveman, staff coordinator. The task force was established by the AJC's National Affairs Commission, of which Bruce M. Ramer is chair and Irving M. Levine is staff director.

Copyright © 1989 The American Jewish Committee
All rights reserved

When the next chapter in the history of American education is written, the 1980s will surely be described as the decade of the "reform" movement. Several national commissions, business and civic organizations, think tanks, foundations and literally hundreds of state task forces issued policy and curriculum recommendations intended to improve the quality of American public education. When the U.S. Department of Education's report *A Nation at Risk* was published in 1983, it became the symbol around which this educational reform movement rallied.

Taken together, the reports covered almost every aspect of school life; many even called for basic structural changes in the ways schools operate. In all this activity there was one consistent recommendation that seemed fairly easy to implement -- more rigorous academic standards for students. State and local legislatures and school boards throughout the country responded quickly by mandating four years of math and English, more science requirements, etc. These reforms marked a positive and welcome change in the public discourse about public education and rallied a broad base of support, even among groups who had disagreed in the past.

The American Jewish Committee welcomed the attention to education even when we did not agree with all the recommendations that were made. We recognized the possibility of developing a consensus that American education should and could be reshaped to help an increasingly diverse student population learn critical thinking as well as basic skills, learn to participate actively in the world of democracy and the world of work, and learn to live and work more harmoniously with each other.

The establishment of new academic standards marked the first stage of the reform movement. They appear to be working, at least for those "students for whom school has always worked anyway -- those who are able to sit still, who are able to keep quiet, who are able to remember after they listen to someone talk for five hours, who are able to pick up a book and learn from it and who have all kinds of family support behind them. But just doing more of the same, in the same old way, has not helped the vast majority of our children, who have not and are not able to learn well in traditional ways," according to Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers. Terrell H. Bell, former secretary of education, also contends that the reforms "didn't do a darn thing" to solve the dropout problem or close the performance gap between affluent students and the disadvantaged, many of them minorities.

Educating the entire school population is the goal of the second stage of the reform movement. It is particularly important now because:

(1) *America needs a skilled work force, prepared to deal flexibly with rapidly evolving national and international changes.* If we are to be able to compete successfully in an increasingly competitive world, more of our children must attain greater degrees of academic, technical, and social skills. This goes beyond narrow vocational training or minimal literacy for reading job manuals. Average students need higher order thinking skills and achievement levels long thought necessary and possible only for the privileged few.

(2) *Many Americans are increasingly concerned about an apparent breakdown of the traditional democratic beliefs and values that define us as a people.* We look to the schools to do more to teach young people these democratic values, to help them understand that their actions reflect those values, and to give them the skills to judge between right and wrong and the character to act accordingly.

(3) *Our population is becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse.* The idea of simple assimilation into the American "melting pot" has been replaced by a new awareness that American society is pluralistic, composed of diverse communities and cultures. Schools must learn how to integrate these diverse communities, including many new immigrants, into the American mainstream while respecting their differences.

To educate all our children to work, live, and contribute to the most diverse country in modern history is an enormous challenge. Fortunately, research conducted over the past decade gives us new and practical information about how children learn and how schools work. One thing we have learned is that the schools cannot be expected to do the job alone. The shift from merely providing school services to trying to assure the educational success of all children requires not only substantial restructuring of the schools but new collaborative efforts among the private sector, social and civic agencies, families, communities, and the students themselves.

THE AJC'S INTERESTS

In order to decide how the AJC should be involved in the challenge of the second stage of the reform movement, an Education Policy Task Force, composed of AJC members and consultants with interest and expertise in a variety of education disciplines, was appointed.

The task force believed it was important for the AJC to play a leadership role in developing and strengthening these collaborative efforts. The rationale was well stated in a previous AJC report, *Task Force on the 80's -- Public Education*:

> No feature of American life is more central to our interests than its dedication to an open, pluralistic society. The processes and institutional forces that support this goal and mitigate intergroup conflicts and tensions provide the political and social safeguards so essential to a group that numbers less than three percent of the country's total population. Among these processes and institutions, few have more consequence or potential than universal, public education. Notwithstanding the questions raised about the more idyllic versions of education's history, it was public education that made possible the extraordinary economic and social advances achieved by American Jews in the 20th century.

Improved public education is in our short-term as well as our long-term interest. Most

of our children attend public schools. There is little hard data about Jews in public and private schools. Demographer Gary Tobin, of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University, began to include questions about public education in his research only in the last three or four years. He found that the vast majority of Jewish children attend public schools, most in suburbs but many in cities; that the perceived quality of public schools is one of the three most important variables in home selection, along with price and safety; that, generally, Jews rank the quality of the public schools they send their children to as excellent. (These findings mirror what an annual Gallup Poll on attitudes toward public education finds for all Americans.) When Jews choose private schools, they generally are Jewish day schools, mainly Orthodox.

The task force met with national and local educators and researchers, public figures, and community and ethnic leaders in New York, Orange County, California, and Chicago.

It began by identifying those areas of necessary educational change and improvement in which AJC has expertise, experience, and credibility and in which it might have impact. (Other areas, such as racial integration, appropriate school financing to meet the needs of all children, and church-state issues are, of course, not less important and are still unresolved.) These include:

(1) teaching young people about common core democratic values and encouraging their active participation in the democratic process
(2) strengthening pluralism and intergroup understanding in the classroom through multicultural education
(3) developing and implementing language programs in the classroom based on knowledge of how children of different linguistic backgrounds learn language and communication skills
(4) using intergroup and community leadership skills to mobilize community support to help the schools adapt to these new educational challenges

These issues are particularly significant when viewed in the context of the nation's increasing ethnic diversity. More and more children are entering the schools with different life styles, cultures, and languages. Many come from countries that do not have democratic or pluralistic traditions and are even hostile to them. Others will be the first generation of their group that is expected to attain a high level of academic achievement. These children are going to school with native-born children whose home and school experiences do not always prepare them to deal with diversity or encourage them to achieve.

One might assume that there would be a broad consensus regarding the need to strengthen education around these issues. Yet such a consensus has never developed. Values and citizenship education are frequently viewed with suspicion and hostility; intergroup and multicultural education were off to a good start in the 1960s but have lost momentum and have not been integrated into the curriculum; language issues have been confused in the political and emotional battle surrounding bilingual education.

The task force report analyzes and attempts to clarify these issues, and gives guidelines for -- or examples of -- successful programs so that AJC chapters can bring together relevant local players as partners in meaningful discussion, separate the political from the pedagogical issues, and work with schools in their communities to help shape reasonable policies and programs for improved public education.

THE ISSUES

Values and Citizenship Education

The need for better education about democracy and citizenship is well documented. At a conference held in 1987 by People for the American Way, former president Tony Podesta said: "Not since Watergate have Americans seemed so concerned about our values: the beliefs that define us as a people. Concerned that nobody seems to be playing by the rules anymore, Americans are taking another look at the place where most of us get our formal lessons in the rules of society: the schools." In a recent publication, *Education for Democracy*, the American Federation of Teachers, the Educational Excellence Network, and Freedom House make a compelling plea that "everyone with a role in schooling now join to work for decisive improvement in teaching our children the knowledge, values and habits that will best protect and extend our precious inheritance -- democracy."

In his book, *Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect*, historian Paul Gagnon reveals that the story of democracy in the world, its origin and significance, is not told.

Leaders as diverse as Ronald Reagan and Mario Cuomo, Pat Robertson and Jesse Jackson, are also engaged in public debate about how the schools can do more to teach young people values, including the difference between right and wrong.

Despite this broad agreement on the need for such programs, schools have met resistance when they have tried to put them into place. Parents and others question whether it is the role of the schools to teach values, fearing that children may be indoctrinated into value systems different from their own. They fear the subject is a smokescreen for teaching religious precepts. Others say that the business of the schools is to teach academics and wonder whether the schools have time to add anything "extra."

Many schools have been able to answer these questions to the satisfaction of parents and communities.

(1) *Schools teach values all the time.* Everything a child is exposed to represents a value, including the content or lack of content of textbooks, school policy and programs or inclusion or exclusion of minorities' cultures, and the relationship among various racial and ethnic groups as well as the way students, teachers, and administrators treat each other. Schools aren't always conscious of the powerful effect they have on students' development, and many teachers lack the skill to think and talk about complex questions. Still, they communicate values all the time. It makes sense to help them do it better.

(2) *It is possible to find consensus about values that should be encouraged.* Some of them are suggested in *1984 and Beyond: A Reaffirmation of Values*, published by a task force of the Baltimore (Md.) County Public Schools. Among them are compassion, courtesy, equality of opportunity, honesty, a regard for human worth and dignity, integrity, justice, tolerance, loyalty, patriotism, reasoned argument, respect for others' rights, rule of law, and self-respect.

(3) *It is not necessary to teach religion in order to teach values.* In many cases, religious and civic values are identical although their origins are different. Values like honesty, civility, responsibility, tolerance, loyalty, etc. can be taught in a nonreligious

context.

(4) *A distinction has been drawn between teaching religion, which is the job of the home and religious institutions, and teaching about religion and the role religion has played in history.* Whatever one's views on religion, it is undeniable that it has profoundly influenced America's history and culture. Religious liberty and religious pluralism are basic to American society, yet they are rarely referred to in our textbooks.

(5) *A central purpose of education in our society is to teach young people the values and requirements of democracy and the importance of their active participation in the democratic process.* This requires more than textbook information on how our system works. It requires that the values that are the foundation of the system be defined, taught, learned, and put into action.

Schools around the country are using methods or programs to teach values and citizenship, democratic participation, service to others, moral and character development, critical thinking, etc. Following are a few examples:

(1) *The participatory decision-making method* helps children apply moral reasoning to their own behavior and to the society around them. It teaches democracy *through* democracy, training an active future citizenry by having children behave as citizens in the life of the school.

Participatory decision making requires children to be active in making class rules and solving classroom conflicts. It can be as simple as a suggestion box, or it may involve small-group brainstorming sessions, a "conflict corner" where two students can work out their differences, or a teacher-moderated "fairness committee" to propose solutions to classroom problems.

Class meetings may be held weekly or daily, with decisions made either by consensus or by voting. Voting can be open (to encourage public stands) or secret (to minimize peer pressure). Through methods such as these, teachers send the message to students that they value each child's viewpoint and that the students' participation leads to action.

(2) *The Character Education Curriculum*, distributed by the Thomas Jefferson Research Center in Pasadena, California, is a complete lesson-plan package that enables teachers from kindergarten through the first two years of college to instruct students in what the Center calls the 15 "consensus values" by which their culture operates, such as honesty, respect for others, integrity, courage.

(3) *Self-esteem programs* are designed to help young people value themselves and thus be better equipped to deal with difficult issues when they arise. Children are trained to stand up for what they believe against peer pressure.

(4) *The Early Adolescent Helper Project* places student volunteers in senior centers and child-care, latch-key, and Head Start programs where they learn firsthand about the world of work and prepare for their own roles as citizens, workers, and parents. At the same time, this project provides extra hands for overworked community service agency staffs, while rewarding the volunteers with school credit.

(5) *The Constitutional Rights Foundation* in California has worked for 25 years to

enrich the citizenship education of secondary-school students. For example, the students read Greek mythology and Aristides for analogies to gang warfare in East L.A. CRF's programs teach conflict resolution, respect for the rights of others, self-respect, and a mature and balanced attitude toward authority. The foundation also helps schools develop mock trial competitions, youth community-service programs, Bill of Rights education, peer tutoring programs, etc.

(6) *Citizenship in New York City*, a 300-page curriculum by the New York City Board of Education, was designed to teach civic responsibility and the moral and ethical principles that lead to good citizenship. The underlying concept is that the responsibilities of citizenship are exercised in ever-widening spheres: what one owes to oneself, to others, to one's neighborhood, to the larger community. All school personnel are asked to play a part in teaching the values held by good citizens, including teachers in classrooms, supervisors on their daily rounds, dieticians in the lunchrooms, etc. In their own conduct and relationships they demonstrate and model good citizenship

(7) *The American Federation of Teachers* provides material for teaching traditional values, including responsibility, honesty, courage, and compassion. The materials, compiled by a panel of experts in philosophy, history, literature, education, and psychology, have been excerpted from classical and contemporary literature, folk tales and fables, newspapers, court cases, music, art, and film. They can be easily assimilated into the regular curriculum.

(8) *The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)* has published a comprehensive set of recommendations in a new report, *Moral Education in the Life of the Schools* (1988).

Multicultural and Intergroup-Relations Education

The 1960s and early 1970s were halcyon days for intergroup-relations education. In-service courses were mandated for teachers. Colleges and universities had departments devoted to the discipline, and a corps of professional practitioners began to emerge. Unfortunately, the momentum slowed during the various budget and financial crises of the '70s. The field was seen as a "frill" and was among the first to be cut. That perpetuated the myth that young children are identical blank slates whose cultural backgrounds can be overlooked in the learning process; it ignored the fact that the racial and ethnic tensions of a pluralistic society are reflected in the life of the schools; and it neglected the educational opportunities that the presence of diverse cultural and linguistic groups and communities offers to the schools.

There is now a resurgence of interest in the issue for several reasons. Teachers are asking for help in dealing with an increasingly diverse population of students. They recognize that positive self-image correlates with academic achievement. An apparent rise in racial and ethnic tensions demands new responses. There is also increased understanding that America's interdependence with the rest of the world requires broader knowledge and understanding of other countries and cultures.

All this requires that we look again at the theoretical basis on which intergroup and multicultural education was conceptualized and taught, discard what did not work, build on what did, and continually develop and redevelop ways of doing things that will find a permanent place in the structure of the schools.

In the past, intergroup-relations programs dealt almost exclusively with racial distinctions. Little serious attention was paid to the experiences of European-American ethnic groups such as Jewish Americans, Polish Americans, Italian Americans, etc. This frequently led to an attitude among white students and teachers that "ethnic studies" is the study of "them" whereas American studies is the study of "us." It also ignored the fact that American culture is the sum of varied racial and ethnic experiences.

Now it is recognized that the American experience needs to be understood in terms of ethnicity as well as race and sex. This broader analysis does not devalue black and Hispanic experiences, but places them within a more complete analysis of American experiences.

Another error of past intergroup-relations programs was the view that only students who are members of a particular minority group need to study that group's history and culture. Most Americans have little understanding of other groups, and tend to think that their own lifestyles are "standard" and others are not. We now realize that all students, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or social class, should learn to appreciate not only their own heritage, but those of other groups as well and to understand the value of pluralism and diversity to American society. It is not enough to merely add a unit or lesson about other groups. Nor is it enough to limit ethnic education to discussion of group heroes, holidays, and foods. Educators must reconceptualize the way society is viewed by devising an interdisciplinary curriculum that reflects the experiences and perspectives of different ethnic groups. For example:

(1) In social studies, students explore the cultures and histories of all American ethnic groups, not merely the experiences of groups attending that school.
(2) In literature classes, materials selected for reading reflect the ethoses of different cultures.
(3) Music, drama, and art classes study or perform works originating in different cultures.
(4) Language studies include the values and cultures of the speakers of the language studied.
(5) Home economics, where varying family traditions are discussed, is not limited to the "traditional American family" and its values.

In addition to revising curricula, there are special programs that help to create a school environment that involves healthy intergroup relations and deals effectively with ethnic and racial incidents when they occur. Among them are AJC's Ethnic Sharing Program and Hands Across the Campus.

Ethnic Sharing is a year-long program designed to train a select group of students, faculty, and administrators in how to conduct a multiethnic human-relations program in their school. The training sessions create a core group of school personnel and students with a commitment to improving ethnic awareness and positive intergroup relations.

To be successful, Ethnic Sharing must have the full support of the school administration. Ideally, student and faculty groups meet two to three hours a month during school hours for ten months. The time frame can be adapted to meet the needs and resources of particular schools or school districts. Both the faculty group and the student group should be representative of the diversity in their school. Participants should have good human-relations skills and relate well to people from different backgrounds.

In the training sessions participants bring their own ethnic backgrounds into conscious thought and see how they influence their classroom behavior; review extracurricular activities and assess their effectiveness in promoting good intergroup relations; identify the most pressing intergroup problems in the school; work on defining appropriate roles for administrators, faculty, students, and parents in problem solving; identify and expand existing curricula that promote healthy group relations; review school policies and actions and develop added guidelines if needed; and identify projects to be worked on during the next year.

Hands Across the Campus was developed by AJC's Los Angeles Chapter in response to tensions and incidents when the KKK and the American Nazi party stepped up recruitment in Los Angeles high schools in the wake of court-ordered desegregation. Educators and community leaders were brought together to provide conflict resolution. Professional educators developed a curriculum guide, conducted in-service training for teachers, and worked with groups of students.

Tenth and twelfth graders in Hands Across the Campus are offered a practical way to understand and appreciate different cultural values and systems. Various units are also designed to assist students develop and share decision-making skills based on their own cultural orientation and an understanding of how our society operates. Extracurricular activities involve the entire student body in symposia, international fairs, essay contests, etc.

The program has become an elective course in the State of California's new history/social studies framework. AJC's Miami Chapter has adapted this program for its schools.

The following guidelines should be kept in mind as schools work to develop a pluralistic climate:

(1) Ethnic pluralism should permeate the total school environment. School policies and procedures should foster positive interactions among the members of different ethnic groups in the school.

(2) Staff (administrative, instructional, counseling, and support) should be as multiethnic and multiracial as possible. There should be systematic, comprehensive, mandatory, and continuing multiethnic staff-development programs.

(3) Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches should be used in designing and implementing the multiethnic curriculum.

(4) Curriculum should help students view and interpret events, situations, and conflict from diverse ethnic perspectives and points of view. It should help students develop skills necessary for effective interpersonal and interethnic group interactions.

(5) Curriculum and programs should make maximum use of local community resources.

(6) Schools should conduct ongoing, systematic evaluations of the goals, methods, and instructional materials used in teaching about ethnicity.

Language Issues

The reform movement calls for literacy for *all* children, whatever their linguistic backgrounds. To achieve this, the schools will have to reexamine their language policies. Unfortunately, several circumstances currently combine to make such a reexamination difficult.

(1) *Language is a highly emotional issue.* Many people take strong, uncompromising positions based on those emotions rather than on information.

(2) *Many school systems resist special programs for children with limited English proficiency.* They believe, incorrectly, that past generations learned English without special help. They fear that such programs will increase costs, disrupt established school programs, retard instruction in English, threaten nonbilingual staff, and promote "separatism."

(3) *The issue is frequently seen as a civil-rights rather than an educational issue.* Parents and advocates of children with limited English-language proficiency (LEP) have had to look to the courts for help. As a result, many school systems that offer bilingual education or other special programs do so only grudgingly and under legal compulsion, sparking further controversy.

(4) *The "English-only" movement fans the controversy.* It diverts attention from the educational issues through its implication that there is only one "good" language, English, and that non-English speakers must be forced by law to learn it. (This is contrary to evidence that newcomers are learning English at the same rate as previous waves of immigrants.)

(5) *The concept of bilingual education, in its many forms, is misunderstood.* Despite the fact that most children who need special help are not getting it and are not in any kind of bilingual program, there is a widespread perception that bilingual education is a major reason that many children are not learning English.

(6) *There is an acute shortage of trained bilingual teachers.* A growing number of minority-language students in the schools are being taught in a language they do not understand, causing frustration and low achievement levels.

But many schools are responding to the challenges as best they can. While bilingual teaching methods were initiated 20 years ago with more good intentions than good pedagogy, today they are grounded in linguistic and cognitive psychology.

In practice there is much overlap among the major bilingual-education models. Some of the most successful programs draw techniques from all, even though there is enormous variation among them.

In *transitional bilingual education*, LEP children study English in classes specially designed for second-language learners and receive a portion of their instruction in their native language to help them keep up in school subjects. The goal is to prepare students to enter mainstream English-language classrooms as soon as possible. The transition is usually completed within two years.

Maintenance or developmental bilingual education attempts to preserve and develop the students' first language while they are adding a second. Typically, native-language classes continue through the sixth grade, although most subjects may be taught in English. Maintenance programs may also function as two-way bilingual education in which speakers of (two) languages are placed together in a bilingual classroom to learn each other's language and work academically in both languages.

In *immersion* programs, children are taught a second language through content-area instruction in that language. The key is providing understandable messages through which children acquire the second language as they learn other academic subjects. Immersion must be distinguished from *submersion*, also known as "sink or swim," in which LEP children receive no special language assistance. (In 1974 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Lau v. Nichols* that submersion violates federal civil-rights law.)

English as a second language (ESL) is a component of virtually all bilingual-education programs in the United States. Because of a shortage of bilingual teachers, for many LEP children it is the only special assistance available. ESL has produced students who can formulate grammatically perfect sentences, but it has often failed to make them proficient communicators.

Increasingly, *communication-based ESL* is superseding the old methods. The new approaches are grounded in the theory that language proficiency is acquired through exposure to comprehensive messages, rather than learned consciously through the study of syntax and vocabulary.

Practitioners can increasingly point to programs in which children are doing well -- both in English and in other subjects. It is clear that special programs, including bilingual education, can be effective if they are properly designed and properly executed.

Perhaps the greatest hope, however, lies in the fact that educators, policy groups, and business leaders are beginning to recognize a corollary issue -- that U.S. society is ill served by our failure to develop second-language competency. That incompetence threatens our diplomatic, defense, commercial, and cultural interests. Increasingly, we need managers, professionals, diplomats, and government leaders who understand the cultures, languages, and customs of other countries.

This issue is broader than English-language acquisition in public schools. Thus it provides a context within which bilingual education and other programs can be addressed more constructively. In this context bilingual education and foreign-language instruction are linked to meet demands for increased literacy for all children; language competence, including proficiency in at least one language in addition to English, is seen as part of the constellation of basic skills generally expected of students. To achieve this competence, all kinds of students could participate in bilingual programs for English competency, foreign-language instruction, and education for international understanding. This perspective is appropriately called English Plus and it is based on two tenets:

(1) Full mastery of English is an essential aspect of language competence in the United States. Mere acquisition of vocabulary and grammar should not be considered mastery of English. The goal is mastery of the formal and informal language system, to be able to communicate.

(2) Competency in at least one other language should be the standard for American students in the future.

The following recommendations are offered to schools moving toward an English Plus policy:

(1) Schools should encourage and strengthen the linguistic skills of children. There should be no implication that any one language is "good" while another is not.

(2) Most children do not learn when they are taught reading and subject matter in a language that is foreign to them. Although *some* children do well in so-called immersion or submersion programs, their experience should not serve as the standard for all.

(3) Bilingual programs can be expanded to include English-dominant students. Children can then serve as mutual resources. Under two-way bilingual programs, children learn from peers as well as teachers. This is a more natural way of learning. Language is taught not just as a subject but as a way of communicating.

(4) Bilingual programs should not segregate children from their peers and should encourage children to understand their own and others' cultures.

(5) All children with limited English proficiency need not be in bilingual classes. Depending on the availability of teachers, the wishes of parents, and the skills and ages of the students, other options may be desirable.

(6) In cases where instruction in a child's native language is not feasible because there are no teachers or too few children in that language group, other techniques should be used. In addition, special efforts to recognize and respect the child's culture, strengths, and difficulties should be made.

(7) Teachers should be fully trained in English and subject matter. Occupational opportunity must not be limited to those of a particular ethnic or racial group.

(8) Foreign-language instructors and training institutions and bilingual educators should work together and with the schools to develop and evaluate programs.

(9) There should be increased emphasis on parent-school partnerships. Parents should not have to look to private schools to offer their children language instruction, and they should be able to have confidence in the instructional methods used by the schools. Dual-language classes should be offered to interested parents and other adults. AJC's New York chapter is currently working on such a program.

CONCLUSIONS

During the task force discussions, special attention was given to the increasing demands that are being placed upon teachers. Members recognized that, in many cases, teachers were ill prepared to satisfy these demands and that extensive in-service training and support are necessary.

In addition, task force members recognized that what we are asking requires that the best, brightest, most imaginative and flexible people be attracted, trained, hired, and retained as teachers.

For this to be done teachers need to be assured the professional status they deserve and do not now have, including more professional working conditions, appropriate salaries, and more autonomy and responsibility in the classroom as well as participation in school-wide decision making.

Many communities around the country are experimenting with innovative forms of such "school based management." Among them are Miami, Florida, which has a shared-decision-making program in which staffing, budgetary, and instructional decisions are based on the consensus of a school's teachers and administrators. In Hammond, Indiana, teachers, administrators, parents, and students serve on a team to make decisions about new programs. Toledo, Ohio, has a joint labor-management review panel which supervises a program to help beginning and veteran teachers improve their performance. In Rochester, New York, a "Career in Teaching" effort aims to provide teachers with a stimulating, professional environment. These and other programs should be evaluated and adapted to meet the needs of other schools where appropriate.

The education reform movement presents a challenge, not just for educators, but for all citizens and civic groups concerned about the future of our society.

The growing recognition of the need for substantial improvement in educational achievement is generating demands for fundamental changes in the way schools are run, and in the recruitment, training, support, and role of teachers.

This is not an easy task. It goes far beyond the capacity of the schools to accomplish by themselves and beyond mere pedagogical expertise or what a good commission or study can accomplish just by saying what is needed. It requires the building of new collaborative efforts among families, educators, administrators, school boards, education advocates, civic groups, and other social agencies.

Skillful and well-directed coalition work over a number of years at local, state, and national levels is indispensable to a successful outcome.

Such work can focus specifically on helping groups understand their common interest in implementing the "second wave" of school reform and shaping a new future for American education.

Appendix

RESOURCES

Values and Citizenship Education

Organizations

American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20001

Constitutional Rights Foundation
601 South Kingsley Drive
Los Angeles, Calif. 90005

Thomas Jefferson Research Center
1143 North Lake Avenue
Pasadena, Calif. 91104

Programs

"Citizenship in New York City"
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

"Early Adolescent Helper Project"
CUNY/Center for Advanced Study of Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

"Project Self-Esteem"
45 Hitching Post Drive, Bldg. 2
Rolling Hills Estates, Calif. 90274

Publications

Building Character in the Public Schools: Strategies for Success
National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, Va. 22314

Moral Education in the Life of the Schools: A Summary
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

Phi Delta Kappan (periodical), February 1988
Phil Delta Kappan Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Ind. 47402

Religion and Publication Education (quarterly journal)
National Council on Religion and Public Education
N 155 Lagomarcino Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Religion in the Public School
American Association of School Administrators
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, Va. 22209

Religion in the Public School Curriculum: Questions and Answers
Americans United Research Foundation
900 Silver Spring Avenue
Alexandria, Va. 22314-2798

Teaching About Religion in the Public Schools, by Charles R. Kniker
Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Ind. 47402

Multicultural and Intergroup Relations Education

Publications

Ethnic Sharing in the Schools: Using Group Identity to Improve Intergroup Relations
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

Multicultural/Community Education (periodical)
Mid-Atlantic Community Education Center
School of Education, Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Va. 22903

Multi-Cultural Leader (periodical)
Educational Materials and Services
144 Railroad Avenue, Suite 107
Edmonds, Wash. 98020

Multicultural Resources in Teacher Training
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

Planning and Organizing for Multicultural Instruction, by Gwendolyn Calvert Baker
Addison Wesley Publishing Co.
Rt. 128
Reading, Mass. 01867

Social Education (periodical), April/May 1988
National Council for the Social Studies
3501 Newark Street
Washington, D.C. 20016

Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies, by James A. Banks
College Division
Allyn and Bacon
7 Wells Avenue
Newton, Mass. 02159

Language Issues

Publications

Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature, by K. A. Baka and A. A. deKanter
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

English as the Official Language: A Policy Statement
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

The Future of the Spanish Language in the United States, by Calvin Veltman
Hispanic Policy Development Project
250 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10003

Guidelines for Bilingual Education
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

A New Direction for Bilingual Education in the 1980s
Academy for Educational Development
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019

School-Based Management

Organizations

Florida Education Association
2929 SW 3rd Avenue
Miami, Fla. 33129

Hammond Teachers Federation
59441/2 Holliman Street
Hammond, Ind. 46320

Rochester Teachers Association
277 Alexander Street
Rochester, N.Y. 14607

Toledo Federation of Teachers
320 W. Woodruff
Toledo, Ohio 43624

General

Publications

A Conspiracy of Good Intentions: America's Textbook Fiasco, by Harriet Tyson-Bernstein
Council for Basic Education
725 15th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Education Through Partnership: Mediating Structures and Education, by David S. Seeley
Ballinger Publishing Co.
54 Church Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138-3730

We Can Rescue Our Children: The Cure for Chicago's Public School Crisis -- With Lessons for the Rest of America, by Herbert J. Walberg, Michael J. Bakalis, Joseph L. Bast, and Steven Baer
Heartland Institute
59 E. Van Buren
Chicago, Ill. 60605

THE EDUCATION POLICY TASK FORCE

Members

Arnold Gardner, *Chair*
Marilyn Braveman, *Staff*
Emily Alschuler, Glencoe, Ill.
William Alschuler, New York, N.Y.
Roslyn Attenberg, Englewood, N.J.
Linda Binkow, Detroit, Mich.
Werner Boehm, New Brunswick, N.J.
Barbara Burstin, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Daniel Cohen, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. Ruth B. Cowan, New York, N.Y.
Florence Daniels, New York, N.Y.
Marion Epstein, Princeton, N.J.
Annette Eskind, Nashville, Tenn.
Valerie Fields, Los Angeles, Calif.
Dr. Edith Gann, East Orange, N.J.
Esta Gildwarg, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Gerald Glass, Garden City, N.Y.
Arnold Goldburg, Littleton, Colo.
Frank Goldsmith, White Plains, N.Y.
Dorothy Gordon, Short Hills, N.J.
Carolyn Dannet Gray, Washington, D.C.
Irving Harris, Chicago, Ill.
Frances Hess, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Dr. Rosalyn Hirsh, Washington, D.C.
T. Edward Hollander, Trenton, N.J.
David Hurwitz, New York, N.Y.
David Jaffe, Detroit, Mich.
Arthur L. Kimmelfield,New York, N.Y.
Eleanor Leo, Los Angeles, Calif.
Alice Rush Levy, New York, N.Y.
Robert Links, San Francisco, Calif.
David Lissy, Mamaroneck, N.Y.
Larry Loewenstein, Atlanta, Ga.
Judith Mellon, Wilmington, Del.
Cathy Minceberg, Houston, Tex.
Judith Moss, Mountain View, Calif.
Elizabeth Parker, Costa Mesa, Calif.
Ruth Pellettieri, Trenton, N.J.
Bruce Ramer, Los Angeles, Calif.
Lila Rich, San Francisco, Calif.
Carol Richmond, Irvine, Calif.
Bernice Rosenbluth, Merion, Pa.
Seymour Samuels, Bayside, N.Y.
Joan Schine, Westport, Conn.
Barbara Schneider, Wilmette, Ill.
Ruth Septee, Philadelphia, Pa.
Brenda Shapiro, Coral Gables, Fla.
Alvin Silverman, Roslyn, N.Y.
Rosaline Sonnewirth, University City, Mo.
Beatrice Steinberg, Queens, N.Y.
Kathleen Straus, Detroit, Mich.
Rosemarie Stromberg, Dallas, Tex.
Steven Swig, San Francisco, Calif.
Amy Tanne, Vancouver, Wash.
Margaret Weinstock, Mamaroneck, N.Y.
Jeff Wilson, Denver, Colo.
Jane Wishner, Albuquerque, N.M.

Consultants

Harriet Tyson-Bernstein, Education Consultant and Author, Washington, D.C.
Janet Carter, Executive Director, Bruner Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Beverly Cole, Director of Education, NAACP, Baltimore, Md.
Arnold Fege, Director of Government Relations, National PTA, Washington, D.C.
Colin Greer, President, New World Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Dennis Gray, Associate Director, Council for Basic Education, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Marjorie Hendler, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.
Marsha Levine, Associate Director, Education Issues Department, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

Alan Lubin, United Federation of Teachers, New York, N.Y.
Stephanie Robinson, Director of Education, National Urban League, New York, N.Y.
David Seeley, Education Consultant, Staten Island, N.Y.
Margaret Shafer, Staff Associate for Education, National Council of Churches, New York, N.Y.

Presenters and Panelists

Dr. Michael Bakalis, Dean of Education, Loyola University
Hon. Martin C. Barell, Chancellor, New York State Board of Regents
Harriet Tyson-Bernstein, Author and Education Consultant
Marilyn Braveman, Director of Education, American Jewish Committee
Joseph Frattaroli, Director, Urban and Ethnic Education Unit, Illinois State Superintendent of Education
Arnold Gardner, Former President, Buffalo, N.Y., School Board
Joseph Giordano, Director, Center on Ethnicity, Behavior and Communications, American Jewish Committee
Dennis Gray, Deputy Director, Council for Basic Education
Colin Greer, President, New World Foundation
Fred Hess, Executive Director, Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance
Bill Honig, California Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dr. Lucinda Lee Katz, Principal, Lower Schools, University of Chicago Lab Schools
Minto Keaton, American Jewish Committee, Los Angeles, Calif.
Kathleen Kirby, Constitutional Rights Foundation
Dr. Robert Klaus, Executive Director, Illinois Humanities Council
Dr. Andrew T. Kopan, Chair, Department of Educational Foundations, DePaul University, Director of Ethnic Liaison, United Hellenic-American Council
Irving M. Levine, Director, Department of National Affairs, American Jewish Committee
Sandy McDaniels, Project Self-Esteem, California
Cathy Minceberg, President, Houston Independent School District Board
Elizabeth Parker, President, Orange County, Calif., School Board
David Roth, Midwest Director, Institute for American Pluralism, American Jewish Committee
Gary E. Rubin, Director of Programs, American Jewish Committee
David Seeley, Author, Professor of Education and Former Assistant U.S. Commissioner of Education
Joan Schine, Former President, Westport, Conn., School Board
Dr. Marietta Saravia-Shore, Columbia University
Burt Simpson, Orange County Coordinator of Instructional Services

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations
165 East 56 Street, New York, NY 10022-2746

February 1989

Single copy $2.00
Quantity prices on request